REMARKS

With this Response, no claims are amended, canceled, or added. Therefore, claims 1-41 and 43-45 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 7-14, 17-24, 27-34, and 37-40

Claims 1-4, 7-14, 17-24, 27-34, and 37-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0062333A1 of Anand et al. (*Anand*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,697,334 of Klincewicz et al. (*Klincewicz*). Applicants respectfully submit that these claims are not rendered obvious by the reference for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites the following:

> associating a security association with a traffic stream;
> **associating a metric value with the security association;**
> **modifying the metric value based on an amount of network traffic generated for the traffic stream;** and
> dynamically mapping the traffic stream to one of multiple components that perform cryptography operations based on the metric value.

Claims 11, 21, and 31 recite similar limitations directed to associating a metric value with a security association of a traffic stream and modifying the metric value based on network traffic generated for the traffic stream.

Anand discusses the offloading of operations from the CPU to other hardware. See [0012] to [0014]. The cited reference discusses that certain operations, such as encryption/decryption, are "CPU intensive operations" and therefore can be offloaded for hardware other than the CPU to perform. See [0014]. Importantly, no metric is used to determine that an operation is "CPU intensive." The operations are simply classified as CPU intensive, meaning that if the operation is selected, it will be offloaded, without any

Application No.: 09/895,344   Examiner: E.A. Shiferaw
Attorney Docket No.: 42390P11391   -9-   Art Unit: 2136

consideration of network traffic or any consideration of a metric value. Thus, cited reference fails to provide support for the assertion on page 3 of the Final Office Action. The "heaviness or intensiveness of encryption/decryption is not described in the reference as having an associated metric, or having any association with network traffic. Thus, the argument in the Office Action fails to find support in the reference.

In contrast to the cited reference, the claimed invention recites a metric value associated with a security association that is modified based on an amount of network traffic generated for an associated traffic stream. Thus, the reference fails to disclose or suggest at least one element of the claimed invention.

The Final Office Action at page 3 further cites *Klincewicz* as disclosing modifying a metric value based on network traffic. Applicants submit that this interpretation is not supported by the reference. Furthermore, *Klincewicz* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Anand* noted above. *Klincewicz* discusses design of a network that supports QoS, and recites various kinds of information (called "input data") that might be used to classify a packet for QoS purposes. See col. 5, lines 22 to 53. The reference states that "input data may be entered by the designer using the input devices 110. The input data may additionally be read from a file located in the database 150." Col. 5, lines 33 to 35. Thus, the reference discusses using stored information in the design of a network to determine how to classify a packet, which is in contrast to the teachings of *Anand* that discusses concepts of **dynamic** offloading, and which is also in contrast to the claimed invention that recites modifying the metric value **based on an amount of network traffic generated for an associated traffic stream**.

Furthermore, the Final Office Action appears to be relying on *Klincewicz*'s mention of "link lengths." Links are mentioned at col. 5, lines 56 to 57 as a connection between elements in

Application No.: 09/895,344
Attorney Docket No.: 42390P11391   -10-

Examiner: E.A. Shiferaw
Art Unit: 2136

a network. The link length is defined at col. 6, lines 31 to 34 as "a value assigned to a link that quantifies how desirable the link is for routing traffic." Importantly, the "link length" is specifically associated with a **link**, as defined above, and fails to support an interpretation of a metric being associated with a security association. The link, as described in col. 6, lines 7 to 20, may include many different channels and many different traffic classes. Thus, the metric referred to in the reference applies to a link as a whole between network elements, and has no suggestion of applicability to a specific security association, which is associated with traffic, and not with a specific physical link, in contrast to the reference.

Thus, the references fail to provide support for the assertions in the Final Office Action. The interpretations given the cited references are outside the scope of disclosure of the references, and not supported by the references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that *Anand* fails to disclose at least one element of the claimed invention, and *Klincewicz* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Anand*. Both references suffer the same defect, and fail, whether alone or in combination, to disclose or suggest at least associating a metric value with a security association of a traffic stream and modifying the metric value based on network traffic generated for the traffic stream, as recited in the claims. Therefore, the references fail to support an obviousness rejection of the independent claims under MPEP § 2143.

The remaining claims depend from the independent claims discussed above. As per MPEP § 2143.03, claim depending from nonobvious are also nonobvious. Therefore, these claims are not rendered obvious by the references for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent claims.

Application No.: 09/895,344   Examiner: E.A. Shiferaw
Attorney Docket No.: 42390P11391   -11-   Art Unit: 2136

Claims 5-6, 15-16, 25-26, 35-36, 41, and 43-45

These claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Anand*

and *Klincewicz* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,209,101 of Mitchem et al. (*Mitchem*).

Claim 41 recites the following:

> associating a security association with a traffic stream;
> associating a metric value with a security association;
> **initializing the metric value to a predetermined value when the
> security association is received by a driver agent, the metric value to be
> modified based at least in part on traffic generated for the associated traffic
> stream;**
> determining whether the security association necessary for performing
> cryptography operations on a packet of the traffic stream is cached;
> determining whether the security association should be cached based on
> the metric value; and
> caching the security association if it is determined from the metric value
> that the security association should be cached.

As discussed above, *Anand* and *Klincewicz* fail to disclose or suggest associating a metric

value that is modified based on traffic generated for an associated traffic stream with a security

association, as recited in the claim. *Mitchem* discusses security policy enforcement with multiple

security servers, and is not cited for curing this deficiency, and in fact fails to cure the

deficiencies of *Anand* and *Klincewicz*. The references, whether alone or in combination, fail

disclose or suggest at least associating a metric value with a security association of a traffic

stream and modifying the metric value based on network traffic generated for the traffic stream,

as recited in the claim. Therefore, the references fail to support an obviousness rejection of this

claim under MPEP § 2143.

Claims 5-6, 15-16, 25-26, 35-36, and 43-45 depend, directly or indirectly, from

independent claims discussed above. The rejection of the independent claims is shown above to

be improper because the cited references, whether alone or in combination, fail to disclose or

suggest at least one element of the independent claims. As per MPEP § 2143.03, claim

Application No.: 09/895,344   Examiner: E.A. Shiferaw
Attorney Docket No.: 42390P11391   -12-   Art Unit: 2136

PAGE 16/17 * RCVD AT 8/29/2005 7:23:40 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/25 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:503 684 3245 * DURATION (mm-ss):06-04

depending from nonobvious are also nonobvious. Therefore, these claims are not rendered

obvious by the references for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to the independent

claims.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been

overcome, placing all claims in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited. The

Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would

further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number

02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP

Date: 8/29/05

Vincent H. Anderson
Reg. No. 54,962

12400 Wilshire Blvd., 7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026
Telephone: (503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States
Patent and Trademark Office at:

Fax No.: 571-273-8300
Signature
Rachael Brown   Date

Application No.: 09/895,344   Examiner: E.A. Shiferaw
Attorney Docket No.: 42390P11391   -13-   Art Unit: 2136